

REMARKS



The claims are 1 to 39.

The above amendment is made to clarify claim terminology in claims 1 and 36.

In the Examiner Interview Summary Record of April 25, 2006, it is required to disclose the substance of the interview.

In Reply, the Final Rejection rejects claims 1 to 39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramanian et al. (6,127,089) in view of Zampini et al. (6,503,689) and in further view of Matsumoto et al. (JP 1-217328) in view of its English language abstract.

This rejection is respectfully traversed, essentially for reasons set forth in the Examiner Interview Summary Record.

In more detail:

The present claims require a resin component having a substituent which is capable of releasing a terminal group to form a sulfonic acid residue after the application of energy.

None of the references disclose such resin component.

While Matsumoto discloses ionic polymers containing a sulfonic acid residue, such polymers are very different from and unsuggestive of the presently claimed resin component which only forms the sulfonic acid residue after application of energy as recited in claim 1.

Further, there is no teaching in Matsumoto that the sulfonic acid residue is responsible for the properties of the disclosed optical material.

Accordingly, Matsumoto is inappropriately combined with the remaining references.

Favorable action is now requested.

THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED  
TO CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY IN THE  
FEE FOR THIS PAPER TO DEPOSIT  
ACCOUNT NO. 23-0975.

Respectfully submitted,

Etsuko NAKAMURA et al.

By: Matthew M. Jacob

Matthew M. Jacob  
Registration No. 25,154  
Attorney for Applicants

MJ/kes  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
May 24, 2006